

I know that the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and the Hispanic-serving institutions would also have an opportunity to join in, who know probably this issue and this problem almost better than anyone else. So I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time. Let me applaud the gentleman for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the farm bill because I believe this is an important investment in America's future. Farm security, investment in the food chain and recognizing that as we look to a new day in securing America, we are going to have to look to the investment in our farmers, small and large.

At the same time, I believe the Dooley amendment provides the opportunity to take just a small measure of dollars, \$100 million, to provide cutting-edge research and technological development as the keys to our Nation's competitiveness in an increasingly global trade market for agricultural products. If we do not invest in the cutting-edge technology, we cannot be in front of the curve to be able to be competitive, to be able to reach the pinnacle, if you will, of the kind of agricultural development that will make us internationally competitive.

Let me also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for recognizing that the land grant colleges, historically black colleges and the Hispanic-serving colleges can be very much a vital part of this research. May I remind everyone of Booker T. Washington and as well George Washington Carver, Booker T. Washington with the Tuskegee Institute and as well George Washington Carver invested in the understanding of farming. These institutions are able to provide the cultural insight and the rural insight into research, and it helps them to develop individuals who will be leaders in research as it relates to competitiveness in agriculture.

I would simply say this is a mere drop in the bucket. I do not want to diminish the amendment, but it certainly is a worthwhile amendment. I ask all my colleagues in a bipartisan way to support the Dooley amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise asking my colleagues to support this amendment. I will tell you how it even impacts me personally. Over 10 years ago, when I came into Congress, I was a full-time farmer. At that time we were producing about on our cotton fields in the San Joaquin Valley about 1,000

pounds per acre of cotton. Today we are producing almost 1,800 pounds of cotton. The financial viability of my farm was not the result of program payments that are coming to us from the Federal Government. The profitability of my farm is much more a function of the investment in research that has resulted in improved varieties that have enhanced yields.

That is the crux of this amendment. It is taking one cent out of every dollar that we would be providing in direct payments and investing it in research so we can continue to see improvements in yields, so we can see improvements in productivity. That has far more to do with the financial viability of farmers than the \$100 million we are providing in direct payments to farmers. That is not an investment in the future.

I just ask my colleagues to step back and take an honest and objective evaluation of what this amendment is all about. It is taking one penny of every dollar in taxpayer subsidies and saying let us invest it in research, let us invest it in the future, et cetera, et cetera. The farmers will see an enhanced level of productivity which will be more to their bottom line than these direct taxpayer payments.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2646 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 248, that debate on amendment No. 47 and all amendments thereto shall not exceed 55 minutes, with 45 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and that no further amendment may be offered after the legislative day of Thursday, October 4, 2001, except one

pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on amendment No. 11 to be offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), that time be limited to 20 minutes on the amendment and all amendments thereto, equally divided by the proponent and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I wanted to make sure there will be another amendment from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) included within my time. I would hope there would be no objection to that.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, the gentleman would not be prevented from offering other amendments, which would be included in the time of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2646.

□ 2012

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Chairman pro tempore) in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 19 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, debate on amendment No. 47 and all amendments thereto shall not exceed 55 minutes, with 45 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and no further amendment may be offered after the legislative day of today, except one pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate, and any debate on the Bono